

### **REMARKS**

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Office Action mailed on June 2, 2009. Applicants respectfully traverse (and do not concede) all objections, rejections, adverse statements, and adverse assertions made by the Examiner. With this amendment, claims 40, 49, and 50 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 40-47, 49, and 50 are presented for examination.

#### **Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 40-47, 49, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Letendre et al. in U.S. Patent No. 6,214,036. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

In the interest of furthering prosecution, independent claim 40 is amended to recite that the inner shaft has an outer diameter, that the bumper has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft, and that the bumper retainer has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft. Independent claim 49 is similarly amended to recite that the inner shaft has an outer diameter, that the bumper has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft, and that the retainer has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft. Independent claim 50 is similarly amended to recite that the inner shaft has an outer diameter, that the bumper has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft, and that the means for retaining the stent has an outer diameter greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft.

Letendre et al. do not appear to teach or suggest all the limitation of claims 40, 49, and 50. For example, the Office Action indicated that Letendre et al. disclose a bumper, pointing to the distal end of the inner shaft 60. This “bumper” does not have an outer diameter that is greater than the outer diameter of the inner shaft 60. Therefore, this structure cannot meet the claimed bumper. Similarly, the projections between the grooves 54 also do not appear to have an outer diameter greater than outer diameter of the inner shaft 60. Accordingly, these structures also cannot meet the claimed bumper. Based on at least distinctions, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 40, 49, and 50, as well as claims 41-47 depending from claim 40, are patentable over the cited art.

**Conclusion**

Further examination and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. It is respectfully submitted that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance in due course is also respectfully requested. If a telephone conference might be of assistance, please contact the undersigned attorney at (612) 677-9050.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD C. GUNDERSON et al.

By their Attorney,

Date: July 31, 2009



J. Scot Wickhem, Reg. No. 41,376  
CROMPTON, SEAGER & TUFTE, LLC  
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 800  
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55403-2420  
Telephone: (612) 677-9050  
Facsimile: (612) 359-9349